arXiv:1403.4485v1 [math.AT] 18 Mar 2014

MAXIMAL SYZYGIES IN EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY

MATTHIAS FRANZ

Abstract. Let T be a torus of rank r and X a compact orientable T-manifold. The equivariant cohomology $H_T^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ is a finitely generated module over the polynomial ring $R = H^*(BT;\mathbb{Q})$. By a result of Allday, Puppe and the author, if $H_T^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ is a syzygy of order $m \geq r/2$, then it is already free over R. In this note we show that this bound is sharp. Our examples, called 'big polygon spaces', are intersections of real quadrics and related to polygon spaces, which appear as their fixed point sets. They are also the first examples of compact orientable T-manifolds for which the equivariant Poincaré pairing is perfect although $H_T^*(X;\mathbb{Q})$ is not free over R.

1. Introduction

Let $R = \mathbb{Q}[t_1, \dots, t_r]$ be a polynomial ring. A finitely generated R-module M is called an *m-th syzygy* if there is an exact sequence

$$0 \to M \to F_1 \to \cdots \to F_m \tag{1.1}$$

with finitely generated free modules $F_1, \dots, F_m$. The first syzygies are exactly the torsion-free modules and the r-th syzygies the free ones. In this sense, syzygies interpolate between torsion-freeness and freeness. We also call any M a zeroeth syzygy. If M is an m-th syzygy, but not one of order $m+1$ (or if $m = r$), then we say that it is of order exactly m, and we write $\operatorname{syzord} M = m$.

Allday, Puppe and the author have initiated the study of syzygies in the context of torus-equivariant cohomology [1], [2]. Let $T = (S^1)^r$ be a torus, and let X be a T-manifold such that its rational cohomology $H^*(X)$ is finite-dimensional. Then $R = H^*(BT)$, the cohomology of the classifying space of T, is of the form described above with generators of degree 2, and the equivariant cohomology $H_T^*(X)$ is a module, even an algebra, over R. Many authors have investigated the cases where $H_T^*(X)$ is torsion-free or free. One insight of [1] was that reflexive R-modules (the second syzygies) are equally important: $H_T^*(X)$ is reflexive if and only if the Chang–Skjelbred sequence

$$0 \to H_T^*(X) \to H_T^*(X^T) \to H_T^{*+1}(X_1, X^T) \tag{1.2}$$

is exact, where X_1 denotes the union of the fixed point set X^T and the 1-dimensional orbits [1, Thm. 1.1]. This often permits an efficient computation of $H_T^*(X)$. Moreover, if X is compact oriented with equivariant orientation $[X]_T$, then the equivariant Poincaré pairing

$$H_T^*(X) \times H_T^*(X) \to R, \quad (\alpha, \beta) \mapsto \langle \alpha \cup \beta, [X]_T \rangle, \tag{1.3}$$

is perfect if and only if $H_T^*(X)$ is reflexive [1, Cor. 1.3].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 55N91; secondary 13D02, 57P10.
The author was partially supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

Syzygies of any order can appear as the equivariant cohomology of T-manifolds. Assume for example that X is a (compact) toric manifold; it is well-known that $H_T^*(X)$ is free over R in this case. By removing two fixed points from X, one can obtain, for any $m < r$, syzygies of order exactly m [1, Sec. 6.1], [7, Sec. 6.1]. The situation changes dramatically in the presence of Poincaré duality [1, Cor. 1.4]:

Theorem 1.1 (Allday–Franz–Puppe)**.** *Let X be a compact orientable T-manifold. If $H_T^*(X)$ is a syzygy of order $m \geq r/2$, then it is free over R.*

The aim of this note is to show that this bound is sharp. For $r \in \{3, 5, 9\}$, Puppe and the author [8] have previously constructed compact orientable T-manifolds X with $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X) = 1$. A modest generalization of the construction appeared in [7, Sec. 6.2]. However, no examples where known so far of rational Poincaré duality spaces X such that $H_T^*(X)$ is a syzygy of order at least 2, but not free. By providing these, we now in particular give the first examples of rational Poincaré duality spaces X such that $H_T^*(X)$ is not free over R, but such that the Chang–Skjelbred sequence (1.2) is exact and the equivariant Poincaré pairing (1.3) perfect.

A vector $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is called *generic* if one cannot split up its components into two groups of equal sum. For generic ℓ and a, $b \geq 1$ consider the real algebraic variety $X_{a,b}(\ell) \subset \mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)}$ defined by the equations

$$\|u_j\|^2 + \|z_j\|^2 = 1 \qquad (1 \leq j \leq r), \tag{1.4}$$

$$\ell_1 u_1 + \cdots + \ell_r u_r = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

where $u_1, \ldots, u_r \in \mathbb{C}^a$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_r \in \mathbb{C}^b$. We call $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ a *big polygon space*. The torus $T = (S^1)^r$ acts on it by scalar multiplication on the variables z_j,

$$(g_1, \ldots, g_r) \cdot (u_1, \ldots, u_r, z_1, \ldots, z_r) = (u_1, \ldots, u_r, g_1 z_1, \ldots, g_r z_r). \tag{1.6}$$

Given that ℓ is generic, $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is an orientable compact connected T-manifold. Permuting the coordinates of ℓ or changing their signs does not produce new equivariant diffeomorphism types, so one can always assume the components of ℓ to be non-negative and weakly increasing (Lemma 2.1).

If ℓ has positive components, one can think of $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ as the set of all r-tuples of vectors in $\mathbb{C}^{a+b}$ of lengths $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_r$ whose sum lies on a fixed b-dimensional complex subspace. The set of T-fixed point set corresponds to setting $z = 0$, which gives all r-tuples of vectors in $\mathbb{C}^a$ of lengths $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_r$ which form a polygon in the sense that they add up to 0. This is an example of a "space of polygons". Various kinds of polygon spaces have been studied by Walker, Hausmann, Klyachko, Kapovich, Millson, Knutson, Farber, Schütz, Fromm and others, see [6], [5], [12, §65] and the references given therein.

Our main result says that for any choice of a, b and r there is a big polygon space $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ that produces a maximal non-free syzygy in equivariant cohomology, and it is essentially unique.

Theorem 1.2. *Let a, b, $r \geq 1$, and let $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$ be generic with $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \cdots \leq \ell_r$.*

1. *Assume $r = 2m + 1$. Then $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$ if and only if $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is equivariantly diffeomorphic to $X_{a,b}(1, \ldots, 1)$.*
2. *Assume $r = 2m + 2$. Then $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$ if and only if $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is equivariantly diffeomorphic to $X_{a,b}(0, 1, \ldots, 1)$.*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 appears in Sections 5 and 6. Before, we discuss generalities of big polygon spaces (Section 2) and their cohomology, first non-equivariant (Section 3) and then equivariant (Section 4). We conclude with several additional comments and questions in Section 7.

Unless specified otherwise, all (co)homology in this paper is taken with coefficients in a field $\Bbbk$ of characteristic 0, and all tensor products are over $\Bbbk$. All manifolds we consider are assumed to be smooth and to have finite-dimensional cohomology. Products of oriented manifolds are oriented in the canonical way according to the order of the factors. We orient the unit sphere $S \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that the induced orientation on $(0,\infty) \times S$ agrees with the canonical orientation on $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Acknowledgements. It is a pleasure to thank Volker Puppe for many stimulating discussions. His calculations with the minimal Hirsch–Brown model indicated the relevance of T-spaces X such that the middle Betti numbers of X and X^T are binomial coefficients as given by Proposition 3.3 and formula (3.16). He also suggested several improvements of the exposition as well as the name 'big polygon space' for $X_{a,b}(\ell)$, in analogy with the big chain spaces introduced in [12]. Moreover, I am indebted to Vinicio Gómez Gutiérrez and Santiago López de Medrano for informing me about their observation that the "mutants" constructed in [8] might be realizable as intersections of quadrics of the form (7.9) and (7.10).

2. Big polygon spaces

Let $r \geq 1$. We use the abbreviation $[r] = \{1, \ldots, r\}$, and for a subset $J \subset [r]$ we write $|J|$ for the size of J, $J^c = [r] \smallsetminus J$ and $J \cup j$ instead of $J \cup \{j\}$ etc. for $j \in [r]$. For a vector $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$, called *length vector* in this context, and $J \subset [r]$ we define

$$\ell(J) = \sum_{j \in J} \ell_j. \tag{2.1}$$

One says that ℓ is *generic* if

$$\forall\, J \subset [r] \quad \ell(J) \neq \ell(J^c). \tag{2.2}$$

In this case J is called *ℓ-long* or *ℓ-short*, depending on whether the left or the right hand side dominates in (2.2). If ℓ is clear from the context, we just say 'long' or 'short'. The non-generic length vectors lie on hyperplanes given by normal vectors with coordinates equal to ± 1. The connected components of the complement of this hyperplane arrangement are called *chambers*. Two length vectors ℓ and ℓ' lie in the same chamber if and only if they induce the same notion of 'long' and 'short'; we write $\ell \sim \ell'$ in this case. Permuting components of ℓ or changing their signs does not affect genericity.

The big polygon space $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ for a, b, $r \geq 1$ and generic $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$ as well as the action of $T = (S^1)^r$ on it have been defined in the introduction. We write points of $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ or the ambient space $\mathbb{C}^{a+b}$ in the form (u, z). The fixed point set of $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is the space of polygons $E_{2a}(\ell)$ studied in [6], [9], [5] and [12]. Note that if ℓ has a zero coordinate, say $\ell = (0, \ell')$, then ℓ' is again generic, and there is an equivariant diffeomorphism

$$X_{a,b}(\ell) \cong S^{2a+2b-1} \times X_{a,b}(\ell') \tag{2.3}$$

where the S^1-action on $S^{2a+2b-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{a+b}$ comes from scalar multiplication in $\mathbb{C}^b$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let ℓ and ℓ' be generic length vectors in $\mathbb{R}^r$.*

(1) *$X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is an orientable compact connected T-manifold; its dimension is $(2a+2b-1)r-2a$.*
(2) *If ℓ' is obtained from ℓ by changing the sign of some components and/or by permuting them, then $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ and $X_{a,b}(\ell')$ are diffeomorphic, equivariantly with respect to the corresponding permutation of the components of T.*
(3) *If $\ell \sim \ell'$, then $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ and $X_{a,b}(\ell')$ are T-equivariantly diffeomorphic.*

Proof. It is clear that $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is compact. Also, by scaling u by $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and suitably increasing the variables z_j, one can connect any point $(u,z) \in X_{a,b}(\ell)$ to the subset $X_{a,b}(\ell) \cap \{u=0\} \cong T$. Hence $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is path-connected.

To complete the proof of (1), we show that $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is an orientable T-submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)}$; for this it suffices to verify that 0 is a regular value of the T-invariant function

$$\begin{aligned} &F_\ell \colon \mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)} \to \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{C}^a, \\ &\qquad (u,z) \mapsto \big(\|u_1\|^2 + \|z_1\|^2 - 1, \dots, \|u_r\|^2 + \|z_r\|^2 - 1, \sum_{j=1}^r \ell_j u_j\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

We start with the case where all components of ℓ are non-negative. Because the function $\mathbb{C}^{a+b} \supset S^{2a+2b-1} \to \mathbb{R}$, $(u_j, z_j) \mapsto \|u_j\|^2 + \|z_j\|^2 - 1$ is submersive, we may by induction assume that all components of ℓ are actually positive. In this case it is easy to see that the differential $DF_\ell(u,z)$ is surjective for all $(u,z) \in X_{a,b}(\ell)$ such that $z \neq 0$. If $z = 0$, then we are inside the polygon space $E_{2a}(\ell)$, and the argument in [5, Prop. 3.1] applies.

If ℓ' is obtained from ℓ as in (2), then changing the sign of some u_j and/or permuting the pairs (u_j, z_j) defines an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)}$ that carries $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ to $X_{a,b}(\ell')$; this automorphism is equivariant with respect to the corresponding permutation of the components of T. This proves (1) for general ℓ and also part (2).

The last claim follows from an equivariant version of the Ehresmann fibration theorem: Let C be a chamber and consider the map

$$F \colon \mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)} \times C \to \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{C}^a \times C, \qquad (u,z,\ell) \mapsto (F_\ell(u,z), \ell). \tag{2.5}$$

The first part implies that F is again a submersion, hence so is the restriction $\tilde F \colon F^{-1}(0,C) \to C$, whose fibre over $\ell \in C$ is $X_{a,b}(\ell)$. Now take a non-vanishing vector field ξ on the line segment $L \subset C$ connecting ℓ and ℓ' and lift it to a vector field $\tilde\xi$ on $\tilde F^{-1}(L)$ which is perpendicular to $\ker T\tilde F$. From the flow of $\tilde\xi$ we get a T-equivariant diffeomorphism between $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ and $X_{a,b}(\ell')$. □

Assumption 2.2. We assume for the rest of this paper that all length vectors ℓ we consider are generic and of the form $0 \le \ell_1 \le \dots \le \ell_r$.

This is justified by part (2) of Lemma 2.1, given that we are only concerned with cohomological features of the big polygon spaces. Because the chambers are open in $\mathbb{R}^r$, we may by (3) even assume the ℓ_j to be positive and strictly increasing. This will sometimes be convenient.

3. Non-equivariant cohomology

As a warm-up for the equivariant situation, let us compute the non-equivariant cohomology of $X_{a,b}(\ell)$. Our general approach here and in the next section is modelled on that of Farber–Fromm [9], [5]. The (equivariant) perfection of the Morse–Bott function however will follow from a simple symmetry argument.

Let a, b, $r \geq 1$. We write $X = X_{a,b}(\ell)$ and introduce the abbreviations

$$V = S^{2a+2b-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^a \times \mathbb{C}^b, \qquad d = \dim V = 2a + 2b - 1, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\bar{V} = V \cap (\,\mathbb{C}^a \times 0\,) = S^{2a-1}, \qquad \bar{d} = \dim \bar{V} = 2a - 1. \tag{3.2}$$

We choose a base point $* \in \bar{V} \subset V$ and define for $J \subset [r]$ the Cartesian product

$$V_J = \{\, (u,z) \in V^r \mid \forall j \notin J \quad (z_j, u_j) = * \,\} \tag{3.3}$$

and for short J also

$$W_J = \{\, (u,z) \in V^r \mid \forall i,j \notin J \quad z_i = z_j = 0,\ u_i = u_j \,\} \cong V_J \times \bar{V}, \tag{3.4}$$

$$P_J = \left\{ u \in \bar{V}^r \mid \forall j \in J,\, i,k \notin J \quad u_j = -u_i = -u_k \right\} \cong \bar{V}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then $V_J \subset W_J \subset V^r \smallsetminus X$ and $P_J \subset (W_J)^T$, moreover

$$\dim V_J = |J|d, \qquad \dim W_J = |J|d + \bar{d}. \tag{3.6}$$

(Our V_J and W_J correspond to V_{J^c} and W_{J^c} in the notation of [5, p. 3105].)

We orient the manifolds V_J and W_J as in [9, p. 71]: Let $J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\}$. The orientations of V and $\bar{V}$ give canonical orientations of V^k and $V^k \times \bar{V}$ according to the order of the factors. We transport these orientations to V_J and W_J via the diffeomorphisms

$$V_J \to V^k, \qquad v \mapsto (v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_k}), \tag{3.7}$$

$$W_J \to V^k \times \bar{V}, \qquad v \mapsto (v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_k}, v_i), \tag{3.8}$$

where i is some index not in J.

Define

$$f \colon V^r \smallsetminus X \to \mathbb{R}, \quad (u,z) \mapsto -\left\|u_1 + \cdots + u_r\right\|^2. \tag{3.9}$$

Lemma 3.1. *This f is a Morse–Bott function. Its critical submanifolds are the P_J for short J. The negative normal bundle of P_J in $V^r \smallsetminus X$ is its normal bundle in W_J, and the index of P_J is $|J|d$.*

Proof. Let $(v,w) \in \mathbb{C}^{a+b}$ be a tangent vector at $(u,z) \in V^r \smallsetminus X$. Then

$$Df(u,z) \cdot (v,w) = 2\langle u_1 + \cdots + u_r, v_1 + \cdots + v_r \rangle. \tag{3.10}$$

If $z_j \neq 0$ for some j, then the map $(v,w) \mapsto v_1 + \cdots + v_r$ is surjective. Since $u_1 + \cdots + u_r \neq 0$, this implies that (u,z) cannot be critical. Hence all critical points satisfy $z = 0$. Formula (3.10) shows that the critical points there are those of the restriction of f to $\bar{V}^r \smallsetminus E_{2a}(\ell)$. They have been found in [5, Lemma 4.3] to be the submanifolds P_J.

The restriction of f to V_J assumes its minimum at the unique intersection point u with P_J, and it is elementary to check that this minimum is non-degenerate. Likewise, the restriction of f to V_{J^c} assumes its maximum at the unique intersection point with P_J, which is again u, and this maximum is also non-degenerate. Since the tangent space of V^r at u is the direct sum of the tangent spaces of V_J and V_{J^c}, this implies that the Hessian of f at u is non-degenerate with index $\dim V_J = |J|d$.

By varying the base point $* \in \bar{V}$, we can reach any point $u \in P_J$. Hence the claim is proven. □

Lemma 3.2. *The Morse–Bott function f is perfect. Moreover, $H_*(V^r \smallsetminus X;\mathbb{Z})$ is free with basis given by the $[V_J]$ and $[W_J]$ for short J.*

Proof. Let $g_1, \dots, g_r$ be generators of the group $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2)^r$. By letting g_j act as complex conjugation on some coordinate of z_j, we get a G-action on $Y = V^r \smallsetminus X$ such that f is G-equivariant. For any short J we have

$$g_j[V_J] = \begin{cases} -[V_J] & \text{if } j \in J, \\ +[V_J] & \text{if } j \notin J, \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

and analogously for $[W_J]$.

Let $c_1 < \dots < c_m < 0$ be the critical values of f, and for some small ε set $Z_k = f^{-1}((-\infty, c_k + \varepsilon)) \subset V^r \smallsetminus X$. Also let $Z_{-1} = \emptyset$. We prove by induction on k that a basis of $H_*(Z_k)$ is given by the short $[V_J]$ and $[W_J]$ such that $f(P_J) \le c_k$. (In this proof, all homology is with integer coefficients.) For $k = m$ this is the desired result.

Consider the long exact sequence

$$\dots \to H_*(Z_{k-1}) \to H_*(Z_k) \to H_*(Z_k, Z_{k-1}) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_{*-1}(Z_{k-1}) \to \dots . \tag{3.12}$$

By induction, the $[V_J]$ and $[W_J]$ such that $f(P_J) < c_k$ form a basis for $H_*(Z_{k-1})$. Let D_- be union of the negative normal bundles to the P_J with $f(P_J) = c_k$, and let S_- be the union of the associated sphere bundles. Then $H_*(Z_k, Z_{k-1}) \cong H_*(D_-, S_-)$. By Lemma 3.1, the images of the $[V_J]$ and $[W_J]$ with $f(P_J) = c_k$ form a basis of these relative homology groups. (Recall that each P_J is a sphere.) The discussion of the G-action above implies that $H_*(Z_k, Z_{k-1})$ and $H_*(Z_{k-1})$ have no G-characters in common. The map δ in (3.12) therefore is trivial, and the sequence splits. This completes the inductive step. □

Proposition 3.3. *$H^*(X_{a,b}(\ell);\mathbb{Z})$ is free, and its Poincaré polynomial is given by*

$$\mathcal{P}(X_{a,b}(\ell), x) = \sum_{J \text{ short}} x^{|J|d} + \sum_{J \text{ long}} x^{|J|d - \bar{d} - 1}.$$

In particular, the Betti sum of $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ is 2^r.

Proof. By Poincaré–Alexander–Lefschetz duality, it is enough to verify that the relative homology $H_*(V^r, V^r \smallsetminus X;\mathbb{Z})$ is free and with Poincaré polynomial

$$\sum_{J \text{ long}} x^{|J|d} + \sum_{J \text{ short}} x^{|J|d + \bar{d} + 1}.$$

(Recall that long subsets and short subsets are complements of each other and that the dimension of V^r is rd.)

Let $\iota_* \colon H_*(V^r \smallsetminus X;\mathbb{Z}) \to H_*(V^r;\mathbb{Z})$ be the map induced by the inclusion. Then for short J

$$\iota_*[V_J] = [V_J] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \iota_*[W_J] = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

For the second identity it is enough to consider the case $J = \emptyset$, where it is true for degree reasons. Our claim follows from (3.13) and the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{coker} \iota_* \to H_*(V^r, V^r \smallsetminus X;\mathbb{Z}) \to \ker \iota_{*-1}. \tag{3.14}$$

□

Remark 3.4. The manifold $\mathcal{BC}^{r+1}_{b+1}(\ell,0)$ defined in [12, §65.1][1] is the fixed point set of the involution of $X_{1,b}(\ell)$ induced by the complex conjugation on $\mathbb{C}^{1+b}$, hence a sort of "real locus" of $X_{1,b}(\ell)$. We note that the mod 2 Betti numbers of $\mathcal{BC}^{r+1}_{b+1}(\ell,0)$ computed in [12, Thm. 65.31] are the same as those for $X_{1,b}(\ell)$, up to degree shifts.

Remark 3.5. The Betti numbers of the polygon spaces $E_{2a}(\ell)$ have been computed by Farber–Schütz [6, Thm. 1] ($a=1$) and Fromm [9, Sec. 3.1] ($a\geq 2$). In contrast to big polygon spaces, their Betti sums depend on ℓ: The Betti sum of $E_{2a}(\ell)$ is four times the number of short subsets $J\subset[r]$ not containing the largest index r. As shown in [6, Thm. 2], there is the sharp upper bound

$$\dim H^*(E_{2a}(\ell)) \leq 2^r - 2\binom{2m}{m} \tag{3.15}$$

if $r=2m+1$ is odd and twice this number if $r=2m+2$ is even. The maximum is realized if and only if $\ell\sim(1,\dots,1)$ (odd r) or $\ell\sim(0,1\dots,1)$ (even r). For example, for $r=2m+1$ and $\ell=(1,\dots,1)$ the Poincaré polynomial is

$$\mathcal{P}(E_{2a}(\ell),x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}\binom{r}{j}\big(x^{j\bar d}+x^{(2m-j)\bar d-1}\big) + \binom{2m}{m-1}\big(x^{m\bar d}+x^{m\bar d-1}\big). \tag{3.16}$$

We conclude this section with a partial description of the product structure of $H^*(X)$. Let $\alpha_J\in H^*(V^r)$ be the Poincaré dual of $[V_{J^c}]\in H_*(V^r)$. Then

$$\alpha_J\cup\alpha_K = \begin{cases}\pm\alpha_{J\cup K} & \text{if } J\cap K=\emptyset,\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases} \tag{3.17}$$

hence

$$\mathcal{I}(\ell) = \langle\, \alpha_J \mid J\subset[r]\ \ell\text{-long}\,\rangle \tag{3.18}$$

is an ideal in $H^*(V^r)$.

Proposition 3.6. *$H^{d*}(X_{a,b}(\ell))$ is a subalgebra of $H^*(X_{a,b}(\ell))$ isomorphic to the quotient $H^*(V^r)/\mathcal{I}(\ell)$.*

Proof. This follows by looking at the degrees in (3.13) and at the following commutative diagram, which is a consequence of the naturality of Poincaré–Alexander–Lefschetz duality:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^*(V^r) & \longrightarrow & H^*(X) \\ \downarrow\cong & & \downarrow\cong \\ H_{rd-*}(V^r) & \longrightarrow & H_{rd-*}(V^r, V^r\smallsetminus X). \end{array} \tag{3.19}$$

□

4. Equivariant cohomology

It will be convenient to consider equivariant homology along with equivariant cohomology. We therefore start with some general remarks about the former; details can be found in [1, Sec. 3] or [2, Sec. 2]. We remind the reader that this equivariant homology is *not* the homology of the Borel construction.

[1]Strictly speaking, the definition of a big chain space in [12] requires all edges to have positive length. However, as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 (3) one can see that $\mathcal{BC}^{r+1}_{b+1}(\ell,0)$ is diffeomorphic to the big chain space $\mathcal{BC}^{r+1}_{b+1}(\ell,\varepsilon)$ for small ε.

Let X be a T-manifold of dimension n. The equivariant homology $H_*^T(X)$ of X (with compact supports) as well as the equivariant homology $H_*^{T,c}(X)$ with closed supports are modules over the polynomial ring $R = \Bbbk[t_1, \dots, t_r]$; for compact X they coincide.

There is a canonical restriction map

$$H_*^{T,c}(X) \to H_*^c(X) = \operatorname{Hom}(H_c^*(X), \Bbbk)\,; \tag{4.1}$$

it is the edge homomorphism of a spectral sequence with $E_2 = H_*^c(X) \otimes R$ and converging to $H_*^{T,c}(X)$, see [2, Prop. 2.3]. Any orientation $o \in H_n^c(X)$ of X lifts uniquely to an equivariant orientation $o_T \in H_n^{T,c}(X)$ under (4.1). The equivariant Poincaré duality isomorphism $\pi_X \colon H_T^*(X) \to H_{n-*}^{T,c}(X)$ is the cap product with o_T.

Suppose that X is a T-stable closed submanifold of a T-manifold Y and let $\iota_*^T \colon H_*^T(X) \to H_*^T(Y)$ be the map induced by the inclusion. The orientation of X being understood, we write $[X]_T \in H_*^{T,c}(Y)$ for its image under ι_*^T.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $T = K \times L$ be a decomposition into subtori, inducing a decomposition $R = R_K \otimes R_L$ (with the obvious meaning). For a K-manifold X and an L-manifold Y there is an isomorphism of R-modules*

$$\times \colon H_*^{K,c}(X) \otimes H_*^{L,c}(Y) \to H_*^{T,c}(X \times Y).$$

For any K-stable oriented closed submanifold $M \subset X$ and any L-stable oriented closed submanifold $N \subset Y$ one has $[M]_K \times [N]_L = [M \times N]_T$.

Proof. We denote by $C_{T,c}^*(-)$ the singular Cartan model for equivariant cohomology with compact supports; its R-dual $C_*^{T,c}(-) = \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_{T,c}^*(-), R)$ gives rise to equivariant homology with closed supports, see [2, Sec. 2.3]. Also, let π_X and π_Y be the projections of $X \times Y$ onto X and Y, respectively.

The well-known cross product isomorphism is equivariant cohomology (here with compact supports) is induced by the quasi-isomorphism of R-algebras

$$C_{K,c}^*(X) \otimes C_{L,c}^*(Y) \to C_{T,c}^*(X \times Y), \quad \alpha \otimes \beta \mapsto \pi_X^*(\alpha) \cup \pi_Y^*(\beta). \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, because we assume $H_c^*(X) \cong H_*(X)$ and $H_c^*(Y) \cong H_*(Y)$ to be finite-dimensional, the map

$$\operatorname{Hom}_\Bbbk(C_c^*(X), \Bbbk) \otimes \operatorname{Hom}_\Bbbk(C_c^*(Y), \Bbbk) \to \operatorname{Hom}_\Bbbk(C_c^*(X) \otimes C_c^*(Y), \Bbbk) \tag{4.3}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of complexes. A spectral sequence argument as in [1, Rem. 3.3] shows that its equivariant extension

$$C_*^{K,c}(X) \otimes C_*^{L,c}(Y) \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(C_{K,c}^*(X) \otimes C_{L,c}^*(Y), R) \tag{4.4}$$

is a quasi-isomorphism of R-modules. Combining it with the Künneth formula and the quasi-isomorphism dual to (4.2) establishes the isomorphism is equivariant homology.

The last claim follows by verifying that both $[M]_K \otimes [N]_L$ and $[M \times N]_T$ restrict to $[M] \times [N] = [M \times N] \in H_*^c(M \times N)$ according to the way we orient products. □

Let X be a closed T-stable submanifold of a T-manifold Y with both X and Y oriented. The *equivariant Euler class* of $X \subset Y$ then is $e_T(X \subset Y) = \iota_T^* \iota_!^T(1)$, where the push-forward map $\iota_!^T \colon H_T^*(X) \to H_T^*(Y)$ is defined as the composition $\iota_!^T = \pi_Y^{-1} \iota_*^T \pi_X$. If $G = S^1$ acts by scalar multiplication on $\mathbb{C}$ (with the canonical orientation), then $e_G(* \subset \mathbb{C}) = t \in \Bbbk[t] = H^*(BG)$. We will need a related case.

Lemma 4.2. *With the above notation, let G act trivially on $\mathbb{C}^a$ and by scalar multiplication on $\mathbb{C}^b$, and let $S \subset \mathbb{C}^a \times \mathbb{C}^b$ be the unit sphere. Then*

$$e_G(S^G \subset S) = t^b.$$

Equivalently, $[S^G]_G = t^b \cdot [S]_G \in H_*^T(S)$.

Proof. By naturality, we can replace S by the normal bundle W of S^G in S. This bundle is trivial, $W \cong S^G \times \mathbb{C}^b$, where G acts by scalar multiplication on $\mathbb{C}^b$, and the product orientation on W coincides with the one inherited from S. This implies

$$e_G(S^G \subset S) = e_G(* \subset \mathbb{C}^b) = (e_G(* \subset \mathbb{C}))^b = t^b. \tag{4.5}$$

Clearly, $t^b \cdot [S]_G$ is Poincaré dual to $t^b \in H_G^*(S)$. So the homological follows once we observe that the restriction map $H_G^*(S) \to H_G^*(S^G)$ is injective. This can be seen by a direct computation, or as follows: Since S and S^G have the same Betti sum, $H_G^*(S)$ is free over $\Bbbk[t]$, *cf.* [3, Thm. 3.10.4]. Hence restriction to the fixed point set is injective, for example because of the Chang–Skjelbred sequence (1.2). □

We are now ready to look at the equivariant cohomology of the big polygon space $X = X_{a,b}(\ell)$. Before starting in earnest, we make a simple observation. It will be sharpened in Proposition 6.3, that time without appealing to [6].

Lemma 4.3. *$H_T^*(X)$ is not free over R. In fact,* $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X) < r/2$.

Proof. By comparing the Farber–Schütz bound (3.15) with Proposition 3.3, we see that the Betti sum of X is always larger than that of its fixed point set. Similar to the preceding proof, this implies that $H_T^*(X)$ is not free over R. Our claim thus follows from Theorem 1.1. □

Let $\iota_*^T \colon H_*^T(V^r \smallsetminus X) \to H_*^T(V^r)$ be the equivariant analogue of ι_*.

Lemma 4.4. *There is a short exact sequence*

$$0 \to (\operatorname{coker} \iota_*^T)[rd] \to H_T^*(X) \to (\ker \iota_*^T)[rd-1] \to 0.$$

Note that here and throughout we use a cohomological grading. For example, an element $c \in H_k^T(V^r)$ has degree $-k$, and degree $rd-k$ in $H_k^T(V^r)[rd]$.

Proof. Set $n = \dim V^r = rd$. Because of the naturality of equivariant Poincaré–Alexander–Lefschetz duality [2, Thm. 3.4], the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H_T^{n-*-1}(X) & \longrightarrow & H_T^{n-*}(V^r, X) & \to & H_T^{n-*}(V^r) & \longrightarrow & H_T^{n-*}(X) \\ \downarrow\cong & & \downarrow\cong & & \downarrow\cong & & \downarrow\cong \\ H_{*+1}^T(V^r, V^r \smallsetminus X) & \longrightarrow & H_*^T(V^r \smallsetminus X) & \xrightarrow{\iota_*^T} & H_*^T(V^r) & \longrightarrow & H_*^T(V^r, V^r \smallsetminus X). \end{array} \tag{4.6}$$

□

Lemma 4.5.

1. *$H_*^T(V^r)$ is a free R-module with basis $[V_J]_T$, $J \subset [r]$.*
2. *$H_*^T(V^r \smallsetminus X)$ is a free R-module with basis $[V_J]_T$ and $[W_J]_T$, J short.*

Proof. The $[V_J]_T$ are preimages of the $[V_J]$ under the restriction map (4.1). Since the latter form a basis of $H_*(V^r)$, this implies, as in the Leray–Hirsch theorem, that the spectral sequence $E_2 = H_*^c(V^r) \otimes R \Rightarrow H_*^T(V^r)$ collapses and that the $[V_J]_T$ form a basis of $H_*^T(V^r)$ over R.

By Lemma 3.2, a basis for $H_*(V^r \smallsetminus X)$ is given by the $[V_J]$ and $[W_J]$ for short J. Hence the same proof works for $H_*^T(V^r \smallsetminus X)$. □

For $j \notin J \subset [r]$, let $\sigma_J(j)$ be the number of elements of J that are larger than j.

Proposition 4.6. *For J short,*

$$\iota_*^T[V_J]_T = [V_J]_T,$$
$$\iota_*^T[W_J]_T = \sum_{j\notin J}(-1)^{\sigma_J(j)}\, t_j^b \cdot [V_{J\cup j}]_T.$$

Proof. The claim is clear for V_J. For W_J, consider first the case $J = \emptyset$, where $W_\emptyset = \Delta_J$ is the diagonal of $\bar V^r$. Then

$$[\Delta_J] = \sum_{j\in[r]} [\bar V^{\{j\}} \times \{*\}^{J\smallsetminus j}] \tag{4.7}$$

in $H_*(\bar V^r)$, hence also in $H_*^T(\bar V^r) = H_*(\bar V^r) \otimes R$. By naturality and Lemma 4.2, we get

$$\iota_*^T[W_\emptyset]_T = \sum_{j\in[r]} t_j^b \cdot [V_{\{j\}}]_T \in H_*^T(V^r). \tag{4.8}$$

The general case now follows from Proposition 4.1: Define the subtori $K = (S^1)^J$ and $L = (S^1)^I$ of $T = (S^1)^r$, where $I = J^c$, and let $\Delta_I \subset \bar V^I$ be the diagonal and s the sign of the shuffle (J, I). Then

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_*^T[W_J]_T &= s\,\iota_*^T([V_J]_K \times [\Delta_I]_L)\\ &= s\sum_{j\in I}[V_J]_K \times (t_j^b \cdot [V_{\{j\}}]_L) = \sum_{j\notin J}(-1)^{\sigma_J(j)}\, t_j^b \cdot [V_{J\cup j}]_T\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

because of the way the orientation of each $V_{J\cup j}$ is defined. □

5. The equilateral case

We now consider the equilateral case given by $\ell = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^r$. This length vector is generic if and only if $r = 2m + 1$ is odd. In this case, a subset $J \subset [r]$ is short if and only if $|J| \le m$. We are going to identify $H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell))$ with the syzygies appearing in the Koszul resolution of $R/(t_1^b, \dots, t_r^b)$, which we review first.

Let N be an r-dimensional $\Bbbk$-vector space, concentrated in degree $2b$, and let $(e_1, \dots, e_r)$ be a basis of the the $\Bbbk$-dual $\tilde N$ of N. (Recall that the generators of $R = \Bbbk[t_1, \dots, t_j]$ have degree 2.) We write $N^{\wedge k}$ for the k-th exterior power of N. The Koszul resolution of $M = R/(t_1^b, \dots, t_r^b)$ over R is

$$\begin{aligned}0 \xrightarrow{\delta_{r+1}} R \otimes N^{\wedge r} \xrightarrow{\delta_r} R \otimes N^{\wedge(r-1)} \xrightarrow{\delta_{r-1}} \dots\\ \xrightarrow{\delta_3} R \otimes N^{\wedge 2} \xrightarrow{\delta_2} R \otimes N \xrightarrow{\delta_1} R \xrightarrow{\delta_0} M \longrightarrow 0\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

with connecting homomorphisms

$$\delta_k\colon R \otimes N^{\wedge k} \to R \otimes N^{\wedge(k-1)}, \quad f \otimes \alpha \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^r f t_j^b \otimes e_j \llcorner \alpha \tag{5.2}$$

for $k > 0$; here $e_j \llcorner \alpha$ denotes the contraction of α with e_j. The map δ_0 is the canonical projection.

For $0 \le k \le r + 1$, we define the *k-th Koszul syzygy* to be

$$K_{b,k} = \operatorname{im}\delta_k[-2bk], \tag{5.3}$$

cf. [1, Sec. 2.4]; the degree shift ensures that each $K_{b,k}$ is generated in degree 0. For example, $K_{b,0} = M$, $K_{b,1}[2b] = (t_1^b, \dots, t_r^b) \lhd R$ (which for $b = 1$ is the maximal homogeneous ideal), $K_{b,r} = R$ and $K_{b,r+1} = 0$. It is clear from the definition that $K_{b,k}$ is a k-th syzygy. In fact, for $k \le r$ we have

$$\operatorname{syzord} K_{b,k} = k \tag{5.4}$$

because otherwise Hilbert's syzygy theorem would imply that the homological dimension of $K_{b,k}$ is less than $r-k$ and therefore that of M less than r. But this is impossible as setting all $t_j = 0$ in the resolution (5.1) gives $\operatorname{Tor}_r^R(M, \Bbbk) = \Bbbk[2br]$.

We write the basis of $\tilde{N}^{\wedge k}$ induced by the chosen basis of $\tilde{N}$ as

$$e_J = e_{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{j_k} \quad \text{for} \quad J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\} \subset [r]. \tag{5.5}$$

Because of the self-duality of the resolution (5.1), $K_{b,k+1}$ and $K_{b,k}$ are for $1 \le k \le r$ the kernel and image, respectively, of the map

$$\tilde{\delta}_{r-k} \colon R \otimes \tilde{N}^{\wedge(r-k)} \to R \otimes \tilde{N}^{\wedge(r-k+1)}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$f \otimes e_J \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{r} f t_j^b \otimes e_J \wedge e_j = \sum_{j \notin J} (-1)^{\sigma_J(j)} f t_j^b \otimes e_{J \cup j} \tag{5.7}$$

up to a degree shift by $-2b(r-k)$. Here $\sigma_J(j)$ again denotes the number of elements of J larger than j.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $r = 2m+1$ and $\ell = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^r$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) \cong \bigoplus_{|J|<m} R\big[|J|d\big] \oplus K_{b,m}[md] \\ \oplus K_{b,m+2}\big[(m+1)d - \bar{d} + 1\big] \oplus \bigoplus_{|J|>m+1} R\big[|J|d - \bar{d} - 1\big]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$.

Proof. We start by computing the kernel and cokernel of ι_*^T in the short exact sequence

$$0 \to (\operatorname{coker} \iota_*^T)[rd] \to H_T^*(X) \to (\ker \iota_*^T)[rd-1] \to 0. \tag{5.8}$$

from Lemma 4.4. It follows from Proposition 4.6 that for any $0 \le j \le m$ the restriction

$$\iota_*^T \colon \bigoplus_{|J|=j} [W_J]_T \to \bigoplus_{|J|=j+1} [V_J]_T \tag{5.9}$$

is essentially the map $\tilde{\delta}_{r-j}$ from (5.7). Thus the kernel of ι_*^T is spanned by the elements

$$[W_J]_T - \sum_{j \notin J} (-1)^{\sigma_J(j)} t_j \cdot [V_{J \cup j}]_T \tag{5.10}$$

for $|J| < m$ plus the kernel $K_{b,m+2}$ of $\tilde{\delta}_{r-m-1}$, and the cokernel of ι_*^T is spanned by the $[V_J]$ with $|J| > m+1$ plus the cokernel $K_{b,m}$ of $\tilde{\delta}_{r-m-1}$. Hence

$$\ker \iota_*^T \cong \bigoplus_{|J|<m} R\big[-|J|d - \bar{d}\big] \oplus K_{b,m+2}\big[-md - \bar{d} + 2\big], \tag{5.11}$$

$$\operatorname{coker} \iota_*^T \cong K_{b,m}\big[-(m+1)d\big] \oplus \bigoplus_{|J|>m+1} R\big[-|J|d\big]. \tag{5.12}$$

The degree shifts follow from (3.6) and the convention that the Koszul syzygies are generated in degree 0.

Next we show that the extension 5.8 is trivial. The free summands of $\ker \iota_*^T$ clearly pose no problem. Because $K_{b,m}$ and $K_{b,m+2}$ both live in even degrees and their degree shifts in (5.8) differ by an odd number, there is no problem, either. Finally, extensions of the form

$$0 \to R[l] \to M \to K_{b,j}[l'] \to 0 \tag{5.13}$$

are always trivial if $l - l' \ne 2b$. For $b = 1$ this has been shown in [1, Lemma 2.4]; the general case is analogous. The sequence (5.8) thus splits.

Hence $H_T^*(X)$ is a direct sum of m-th syzygies by (5.4), so it is an m-th syzygy itself. This is the maximum possible by Lemma 4.3. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let K, L be tori and set $T = K \times L$. Let Y be a K-manifold such that $H_K^*(Y)$ is not free over R_K, and let Z be a L-manifold such that $H_L^*(Z)$ is free over R_L. Then*

$$\operatorname{syzord}_R H_T^*(Y \times Z) = \operatorname{syzord}_{R_K} H_K^*(Y).$$

Proof. Let $j = \operatorname{syzord} H_K^*(Y) < r$. Tensoring an exact sequence of the form (1.1) for $H_K^*(Y)$ with $H_L^*(Z)$ over $\Bbbk$ shows that $H_T^*(Y \times Z) = H_K^*(Y) \otimes H_L^*(Z)$ is again a j-th syzygy. That it cannot be a higher syzygy follows from the characterization of syzygies in terms of regular sequences, *cf.* [4, App. E]: Since $H_K^*(Y)$ is not a syzygy of order $j+1$, there exists a regular sequence $f_1, \dots, f_{j+1}$ in $R_K \subset R$ which is not regular for $H_K^*(Y)$. Hence the same sequence cannot be regular for $H_K^*(Y) \otimes H_L^*(Z)$, so $H_T^*(Y \times Z)$ is not a syzygy of order $j+1$. □

We have seen in Lemma 4.3 that $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell))$ is less than $r/2$. Now we can deduce that big polygon spaces actually realize all syzygy orders less than $r/2$. In particular, the bound given by Theorem 1.1 is sharp for any r.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $m \ge 0$ and $r \ge 2m+1$ and set*

$$\ell = (0, \dots, 0, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2m+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^r.$$

Then $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$.

Proof. Write $k = r - (2m+1)$. We have $X_{a,b}(\ell) = V^k \times X_{a,b}(1, \dots, 1)$ by (2.3). $H_K^*(V^k)$ is free over R_K for the induced action of $K = (S^1)^k$, for example because the fixed point set is again is product of k spheres. Now apply Lemma 5.2. □

6. The general case

In this section $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$ is again a generic length vector, which we assume to be non-negative and weakly increasing.

Lemma 6.1. *Consider the short exact sequence of finitely generated R-modules*

$$0 \to M \to M' \to M'' \to 0.$$

If $\operatorname{syzord} M'' > \operatorname{syzord} M$, *then* $\operatorname{syzord} M' = \operatorname{syzord} M$.

Proof. Recall that a finitely generated R-module N is a k-th syzygy if and only if

$$\operatorname{depth} N_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \min(k, \operatorname{depth} R_{\mathfrak{p}}) \tag{6.1}$$

for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \lhd R$ [4, App. E]. Here 'depth $N_{\mathfrak{p}}$' refers to the depth over $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Localizing the given short exact sequence at $\mathfrak{p}$, we get the short exact sequence

$$0 \to M_{\mathfrak{p}} \to M'_{\mathfrak{p}} \to M''_{\mathfrak{p}} \to 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Together with (6.1), the usual bounds for the depth of modules [4, Prop. 16.14]

$$\operatorname{depth} M_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \min(\operatorname{depth} M'_{\mathfrak{p}}, \operatorname{depth} M''_{\mathfrak{p}} + 1), \tag{6.3}$$

$$\operatorname{depth} M'_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \min(\operatorname{depth} M_{\mathfrak{p}}, \operatorname{depth} M''_{\mathfrak{p}}) \tag{6.4}$$

imply $\operatorname{depth} M_{\mathfrak{p}} = \operatorname{depth} M'_{\mathfrak{p}}$, which proves the claim. □

Lemma 6.2. $\operatorname{syzord} H^*_T(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = \operatorname{syzord} \operatorname{coker} \iota^T_*$.

Proof. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to \ker \iota^T_* \to H^T_*(V^r \smallsetminus X_{a,b}(\ell)) \to H^T_*(V^r) \to \operatorname{coker} \iota^T_* \to 0, \tag{6.5}$$

whose two middle terms are finitely generated free R-modules by Lemma 4.5. By splicing (6.5) together with the exact sequence (1.1) for $M = \operatorname{coker} \iota^T_*$, we see that $\operatorname{syzord} \ker \iota^T_* \geq \operatorname{syzord} \operatorname{coker} \iota^T_* + 2$. The claim thus follows from Lemmas 4.4 and 6.1. □

For any $J \subset [r]$, define

$$\sigma_\ell(J) = \big|\, \{\, j \in J \mid J \smallsetminus j \ \ \ell\text{-short} \,\} \,\big| \tag{6.6}$$

and then

$$\mu(\ell) = \min\{\, \sigma_\ell(J) \mid J \ \ell\text{-long and } \sigma_\ell(J) > 0 \,\}. \tag{6.7}$$

Note that there is always a long J such that $\sigma_\ell(J) > 0$. For instance, if J is a long subset of minimal size, then $J \neq \emptyset$ and $\sigma_\ell(J) = |J| > 0$.

Proposition 6.3. $\operatorname{syzord} H^*_T(X_{a,b}(\ell)) < \mu(\ell) \leq r/2$.

Proof. The second inequality, known from Lemma 4.3, follows now by looking at long subsets of minimal size, keeping in mind that half of all subsets are long.

By Lemma 2.1, the syzygy order of $H^*_T(X_{a,b}(\ell))$ depends only on the chamber containing ℓ, and the same holds for $\mu(\ell)$. So we may assume ℓ to be positive. By Lemma 6.2, it is enough to show that $M = \operatorname{coker} \iota^T_*$ is not a syzygy of order $k = \mu(\ell)$.

From Proposition 4.6 we know that M is generated by the $[V_J]_T$ for long J, subject to the relations

$$\sum_{\substack{j \notin J \\ J \cup j \text{ long}}} (-1)^{\sigma_J(j)}\, t_j \cdot [V_{J \cup j}]_T = 0 \tag{6.8}$$

for short J. Because the short sets are the complements of the long ones, there is a short J such that $J \cup j$ is long only for k values $j = j_1, \ldots, j_k$. We claim that the regular sequence $t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_k} \in R$ is not M-regular: The image of $[V_{j_k}]_T$ in the quotient $M/(t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_{k-1}})M$ is non-zero, but $t_{j_k}[V_{j_k}]_T = 0$ there because of (6.8). Hence multiplication by t_{j_k} is not injective. Since there is a regular sequence in A of length k which is not M-regular, M is not a k-th syzygy. □

Corollary 6.4.

(1) *Assume that* $r = 2m+1$ *is odd. Then* $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$ *if and only if* $\ell \sim (1,\dots,1)$.
(2) *Assume that* $r = 2m+2$ *is even. Then* $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = m$ *if and only if* $\ell \sim (0,1,\dots,1)$.

Together with Lemma 2.1 (3) this proves Theorem 1.2.

Proof. We have seen in Section 5 that the length vectors $(1,\dots,1) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+1}$ and $(0,1,\dots,1) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m+2}$ produce syzygies of order exactly m.

For the converse, we start with the case of odd r. By Proposition 6.3 all ℓ-long subsets have size at least $m+1$. This holds for half of all subsets of $[r]$. At the same time, half of all subsets are long. So we see that the ℓ-long subsets are exactly those with at least $m+1$ elements. Hence $\ell \sim (1,\dots,1)$.

We now turn to the even case; by Lemma 2.1 we may assume ℓ to be strictly increasing. The long subsets have again size at least $m+1$. Among all long subsets J of size $m+1$, pick one with minimal $\ell(J)$. (Since half of all subsets are long, it is impossible that there is no long subset of this size.) Let $j_{\min}$ and $j_{\max}$ be the minimal and maximal element of J, respectively. Set $I = J \smallsetminus \{j_{\max}\}$; it is short. There must be at least $m+1$ elements $j \notin I$ such that $I \cup j$ is long for otherwise $\mu(\ell) \le \sigma(I^c) < m+1$. Since we have chosen a J with minimal $\ell(J)$, this can only happen if $\ell_j \ge \ell_{j_{\max}}$, *i. e.*, if $j \ge j_{\max}$. Hence there are at least m elements j greater than $j_{\max}$. If $j_{\min} = 1$, then $\ell(J) \le \ell(J^c)$, so J would not be long. Thus, $J = \{2,3,\dots,m+2\}$. Since $J^c = \{1, m+3, \dots, r\}$ is short, so must be all subsets containing 1 and up to m other elements. But these are already half of all subsets. We conclude that the short subsets are exactly those which have size at most $m+1$ and contain 1. This is the same notion of 'short' as given by the length vector $(0,1,\dots,1)$. □

Conjecture 6.5. $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X_{a,b}(\ell)) = \mu(\ell) - 1$.

Using Macaulay2 [11] and the lists of chambers computed by Hausmann–Rodriguez and Wang [13], this has been verified for all chambers in dimensions $r \le 9$.

7. Comments and questions

7.1. **The mutants.** In [8, Sec. 4] Puppe and the author constructed three examples of compact orientable T-manifolds such that $\operatorname{syzord} H_T^*(X) = 1$. These spaces were called "mutants of compactified representations". We sketch a proof that Z_2, the smallest of those examples, is equivariantly homeomorphic to the big polygon space $X = X_{1,1}(1,1,1)$. The mutants for $r = 5$ and $r = 9$ are not big polygon spaces, however: While they have the same dimension and the same Betti sum as $X_{1,1}(\ell)$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^r$, the individual Betti numbers differ.

We start by observing that the quotient X/T can be identified with the subspace X_+ of X where all coordinates z_j are non-negative real numbers. Moreover, the restriction $T \times X_+ \to X$ of the action displays X as an identification space,

$$X = \big(T \times X_+\big) \,/\sim . \tag{7.1}$$

Here two points (g,u,z), $(g',u',z') \in T \times X \subset T \times \mathbb{C}^a \times \mathbb{C}^b$ are identified if $(u,z) = (u',z')$ and if $g^{-1}g'$ lies in the coordinate subtorus

$$\big\{\, g \in (S^1)^3 \;\big|\; g_j = 1 \text{ if } z_j = 0 \,\big\} \subset T. \tag{7.2}$$

The mutant Z_2 is an identification space by construction,

$$Z_2 = \big(T \times Q\big) \,/\sim . \tag{7.3}$$

Here Q is a 4-ball, and the non-trivial identifications happen over the 3-sphere ∂Q in the following way: Take a 2-sphere and divide it into three spherical digons. (This is the boundary of the orbit space of the compactified standard representation of T on $\mathbb{C}^3$ with its partition into orbit types.) Lift this partition along the Hopf fibration $\partial Q \approx S^3 \to S^2$. The subtori needed for the identification space (7.3) then are the isotropy groups occurring in $\mathbb{C}^3$, which are again the coordinate subtori of T.

Hence it is enough to find a homeomorphism between the two orbit spaces X_+ and Q that respects the partitions used for the identifications. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ be the unit ball with respect to the maximum norm $\|u\|_\infty = \max(|u_1|, |u_2|, |u_3|)$. Since in X_+ all coordinates z_j are non-negative real numbers, the projection

$$X_+ \to \mathbb{C}^3, \quad (u, z) \mapsto u \tag{7.4}$$

is a homeomorphism onto the intersection of D with the subspace $u_1 + u_2 + u_3 = 0$; call it P. (This is the configuration space of all triangles, possibly degenerate, with sides of length at most 1.) Note that P is homeomorphic to a 4-ball, and that the non-trivial identifications in (7.1) happen exactly over its boundary $\partial P \approx S^3$.

Now consider the map

$$p\colon \partial P \to \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad u \mapsto \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{3} (1 - |u_j|)\, \lambda_j, A(u)\Big) \tag{7.5}$$

where $A(u)$ is the oriented area of the polygon with sides u_1, u_2, u_3, and the λ_j's are the cubic roots of unity.

Lemma 7.1. *The image B of p is homeomorphic to a 2-sphere, and $p\colon \partial P \to B$ is the Hopf fibration.*

Proof. We start by showing that the image of the map

$$\bar{p}\colon \partial P \to \mathbb{C}, \quad u \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{3} (1 - |u_j|)\, \lambda_j \tag{7.6}$$

is a triangle. Since $u \in \partial P$, at least one the u_j's has length 1, say u_3. Then $\bar{p}(u)$ lies inside the triangle with vertices λ_1, λ_2 and the origin. In fact, it is the whole triangle because the only restriction on the lengths $|u_j| \in [0, 1]$ is the triangle inequality, which under the assumption $|u_3| = 1$ translates into the equation

$$(1 - |u_1|) + (1 - |u_2|) \le 1 + (1 - |u_3|) = 1. \tag{7.7}$$

Thus, the image of $\bar{p}$ is the triangle spanned by the λ_j's. The argument also shows that one can recover the lengths $|u_j|$ from $\bar{p}(u)$.

If the lengths are known, there are only two choices for the oriented area $A(u)$, except when all sides are parallel, in which case there is only one. The latter case corresponds to the boundary of the triangle $\bar{p}(\partial P)$. Hence the image of p consists of two triangles, glued together at their boundaries. This gives a 2-sphere.

It is obvious that p is invariant under rotations of the complex plane. This action is free since at most one u_j can be zero. Moreover, the side lengths and the oriented area determine the triangle up to rotation. So p is a principal S^1-fibration. Since domain and codomain are spheres, it must be the Hopf fibration. □

One readily checks that the partition of X_+ by orbit type corresponds to a partition of B into three spherical digons, each containing both poles and one edge of the triangle forming the equator. Because this is the same partition as for the mutant, this proves that X and Z are T-equivariantly homeomorphic.

7.2. **Connected sums of sphere products.** Assume $r = 3$ and consider u_1 and u_2 as elements of $\mathbb{R}^{2a}$. Introduce new variables $\tilde z_1, \dots, \tilde z_3 \in \mathbb{C}^b$ and $\tilde u \in \mathbb{C}^{2a}$ via

$$\tilde z_k = \frac{z_k}{\sqrt{3}}, \qquad \tilde u = \frac{u_2 - u_1}{\sqrt{6}} + i\,\frac{u_1 + u_2}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{7.8}$$

Then $X_{a,b}(1,1,1)$ is defined by the equations

$$\lambda_1\|\tilde z_1\|^2 + \lambda_2\|\tilde z_2\|^2 + \lambda_3\|\tilde z_3\|^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{2a} \tilde u_l^2 = 0, \tag{7.9}$$

$$\|\tilde z_1\|^2 + \|\tilde z_2\|^2 + \|\tilde z_3\|^2 + \|\tilde u\|^2 = 1, \tag{7.10}$$

where $\lambda_k = 2\,e^{2\pi k i/3}$ are the cubic roots of 8. The intersection of the two real quadrics (7.9) has an isolated singularity at the origin, and equation (7.10) exhibits $X_{a,b}(1,1,1)$ as its link.

Because the origin is in the interior of the triangle spanned by the λ_k's, it follows from a result of Gómez Gutiérrez and López de Medrano [10, Main Thm.] that this space is diffeomorphic to a connected sum of products of spheres,

$$X_{a,b}(1,1,1) \cong \#_3\, S^{2a+2b-1} \times S^{2a+4b-2}\,; \tag{7.11}$$

for $a = b = 1$ a homeomorphism of this form was already established in [8, Sec. 7]. This is essentially the only case where this happens, apart from the trivial case with a single summand, *cf.* (2.3),

$$X_{a,b}(0,\dots,0,1) = (S^{2a+2b-1})^{r-1} \times S^{2a-1}. \tag{7.12}$$

Proposition 7.2. *If $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ has the cohomology algebra of a connected sum of products of spheres, then either $\ell \sim (0,\dots,0,1)$ or $\ell \sim (1,1,1)$.*

Proof. Recall first that the chamber given by $\ell = (0,\dots,0,1)$ is the only one for $r \le 2$ (assuming that ℓ is non-negative and weakly-increasing); for $r = 3$ there is exactly one more, given by $\ell = (1,1,1)$, *cf.* [12, p. 374].

Write $X = X_{a,b}(\ell)$. By (7.11) we can assume $\ell \not\sim (0,\dots,0,1)$. Then $r \ge 3$, and all singleton sets are short. Assume

$$H^*(X) \cong H^*\big(Y_1 \# \dots \# Y_k\big), \tag{7.13}$$

where each Y_i is a product of at least two spheres. By Proposition 3.3, the dimension of each sphere must be at least d, and if r_i denotes the number of d-spheres in Y_i, then $r_1 + \dots + r_k = \dim H^d(X) = r$.

We know from Proposition 3.6 that $H^d(X)$ generates a subalgebra of dimension 2^{r-1}. Since Y_i is a product of spheres, the subalgebra generated by $H^d(Y_i)$ has dimension 2^{r_i}. Hence (7.13) implies

$$(2^{r_1} - 1) + \dots + (2^{r_k} - 1) = 2^{r-1} - 1. \tag{7.14}$$

Now

$$(2^{r_1} - 1) + (2^{r_2} - 1) \le 2^{r_1 + r_2 - 1} - 1 \tag{7.15}$$

with equality if and only if $r_1 = 1$ or $r_2 = 1$. Applying this repeatedly, we see that the only possibility for equality in (7.14) is $k = 3$ and $r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = 1$. Hence $r = 3$, and $\ell \sim (1, 1, 1)$ by the remark made at the beginning. □

Remark 7.3. One can write any $X_{a,b}(\ell)$ as the link of an intersection of $r - 1$ homogeneous quadrics: The sum of all r equations (1.4) defines a sphere S in $\mathbb{C}^{r(a+b)}$, and subtracting a multiple of this equation from the other ones makes them homogeneous. Eliminating some variables disposes of (1.5).

Let Y be the real algebraic variety defined by $r-1$ of the homogeneous quadrics thus obtained. It is smooth at the points lying on the sphere S because together with the equation for S these quadrics define the manifold $X_{a,b}(\ell)$. By homogeneity, this implies that Y has at most an isolated singularity at the origin, with link $X_{a,b}(\ell)$.

7.3. **Minimal dimension.** We have seen that for any $m \geq 0$ there is an equilateral big polygon space $X_{a,b}(1, \dots, 1)$ whose T-equivariant cohomology is a syzygy of order exactly m. The torus rank is $r = 2m + 1$, which is minimal by Theorem 1.1. The dimension of X is at least $n = 6m + 1$; this value is realized for $a = b = 1$. For $m = 0$ this is clearly the minimum dimension possible as any torus action on a discrete space is trivial. More surprisingly, it is also minimal for $m = 1$. This follows from the bound on the torus rank together with the following consequence of the quotient criterion for syzygies in equivariant cohomology [7, Cor. 5.4]:

Proposition 7.4. *Let X be a compact orientable T-manifold such that $H_T^*(X)$ is torsion-free, but not free over R. Then* $\dim X \geq 2r + 1$.

Question 7.5. For $m \geq 2$, do examples exist in dimension smaller than $6m + 1$?

References

[1] C. Allday, M. Franz, V. Puppe, Equivariant cohomology, syzygies and orbit structure, `arXiv:1111.0957v2`, to appear in *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*

[2] C. Allday, M. Franz, V. Puppe, Equivariant Poincaré–Alexander–Lefschetz duality and the Cohen–Macaulay property, `arXiv:1303.1146v3`, to appear in *Alg. Geom. Top.*

[3] C. Allday, V. Puppe, *Cohomological methods in transformation groups*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1993

[4] W. Bruns, U. Vetter, *Determinantal rings*, LNM **1327**, Springer, Berlin 1988; doi:10.1007/BFb0080378

[5] M. Farber, V. Fromm, The topology of spaces of polygons, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **365** (2013), 3097–3114; doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-2012-05722-9

[6] M. Farber, D. Schütz, Homology of planar polygon spaces, *Geom. Dedicata* **125** (2007), 75–92; doi:10.1007/s10711-007-9139-7

[7] M. Franz, A geometric criterion for syzygies in equivariant cohomology, `arXiv:1205.4462`

[8] M. Franz, V. Puppe, Freeness of equivariant cohomology and mutants of compactified representations, pp. 87–98 in: M. Harada *et al.* (eds.), Toric topology (Osaka, 2006), *Contemp. Math.* **460**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2008; doi:10.1090/conm/460/09012

[9] V. Fromm, The topology of spaces of polygons, doctoral thesis, Durham University 2011; available at `http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3208/`

[10] V. Gómez Gutiérrez, S. López de Medrano, Topology of the intersections of quadrics II, CRM Preprint **1175** (2013); available at `http://www.crm.cat/en/Publications/Publications/2013/Pr1175.pdf`

[11] D. R. Grayson, M. E. Stillman, Macaulay2, available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`

[12] J.-C. Hausmann, *Mod two homology and cohomology*, book project (version 23/12/2013); available at `http://www.unige.ch/math/folks/hausmann/`

[13] J.-C. Hausmann, E. Rodriguez, Corrections and additional material to "The space of clouds in an Euclidean space", available at `http://www.unige.ch/math/folks/hausmann/polygones/`

Department of Mathematics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont. N6A 5B7, Canada
E-mail address: mfranz@uwo.ca